

**COTS Enterprise Architecture Workgroup  
Meeting Minutes  
June 28, 2000**

**Members Present:**

Murali Rao, VDOT (Cochairman); James Jokl, UVA; Bob Pontius, VEC; Bethann Canada, DOE; Tim Bass, VRS; Linda Foster, TAX; Bill Mize, DIT; Bob Haugh, DOC; Ted McCormack, CLG

**Members Absent:**

David Molchany, Fairfax (Cochairman); Randy Horton, DRS; Donald Byrne, DCR

**Staff Present:**

Andy Poarch, DIT; Dan Ziomek, DTP; Bryan Drake, DIT; Paul Bucher, VDOT

**Guests:**

roy DeLung, DEQ (for Donald Byrne, DCR); Jerry Simonoff, DTP

**Agenda:**

9:00 to 9:10 Opening Remarks and Review of June 6 Minutes – David Molchany & Murali Rao

9:10 to 9:20 Discussion and Approval of COTS EA Workgroup Revised Statement of Purpose

9:20 to 9:50 Discussion of Current VAEA Initiative Documentation and Related Research Conducted by Members

- Questions?
- Changes?

9:50 to 10:00 Break

10:00 to 11:30 Strategy Discussion & Work Plan Development

11:30 to 11:40 Frequency, Time and Location of Meetings?

11:40 to 11:50 Other Business & Summary of Workgroup Decisions

## 11:50 Adjournment - Location, Date & Time of Next Meeting

### Discussion:

The June 28, 2000 meeting of the COTS EA Workgroup was called to order by the Cochairman, Murali Rao. The minutes from the June 6 meeting of the workgroup were approved without revision.

Following introductory remarks by Murali Rao, Dan Ziomek gave a report on the Commonwealth EA Web site. DIT has arranged for Design.Com to maintain the site. Dan will be working with Design.com, the workgroup support staff, and interested members of the workgroup, on site redesign. Dan asked workgroup members to review the site and make recommendations for design improvements. As the Commonwealth EA Initiative matures, the EA Web site must allow for very dynamic and flexible growth and easy maintenance. A secondary objective of the redesign is to better coordinate the look-and-feel of the EA site with the COTS and SoTech sites (also undergoing redesign).

Following discussion of the revised COTS EA Workgroup Statement of Purpose, members approved the statement with the following revision: expand the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet to read, "Reviewing and approving the work of the EA Team, to include Domain Teams and Support Staff." Dave Molchany will present the revised statement of purpose to COTS at their next meeting.

The workgroup then conducted a general discussion of current VAEA Initiative documentation and related research/documentation provided by members. The purpose of the discussion was to consider possible changes to current VAEA documentation and future strategies that could be incorporated into the workgroup work plan. Before the meeting, the following information was distributed to members for their consideration: a hyperlink to the [North Carolina Technology Architecture](#); a hyperlink to the [Fairfax IT Architecture](#); and, architecture documents from the Department of Taxation. During the discussion, Murali Rao presented 3 documents used by the VDOT EA architecture effort and gave a very brief overview of the documents. The documents were, "A Conceptual Architecture for VDOT (Executive Summary) DRAFT", "[VDOT Technology and Information Management Program – Strategic Plan October 1999](#)", and "VDOT Enterprise Computing Environment, Three-Year Planning Horizon Document." Dan Ziomek passed out copies of two additional documents from the North Carolina Technology Architecture: "Chapter 1 – Conceptual Architecture"; and, "Chapter 6 – Application Communication Middleware Architecture."

During the general discussion, members noted that the considered documents represented either a very high level (visionary/conceptual) view of architecture or a very detailed, technical (standards based) view of architecture. The workgroup supported developing an enterprise architecture for the Commonwealth that would tie these two extreme views together and suggest EA solutions that will be highly adaptive with a high probability of funding and successful implementation.

Following consideration of the EA related documentation and research that had been distributed to the workgroup, members conducted a preliminary discussion about what specific strategy would best support the successful implementation of a Commonwealth EA. Alternative strategies, including top-down vs. middle-out vs. parallel development, were considered. The consensus of the workgroup was that a parallel development strategy, defined as the simultaneous development of the Common Requirements Vision (CRV) and Conceptual Architecture (CA) along with a "drill-down" development of selected, priority domain architectures, would have the greatest probability of long term success and immediate payback. Some initial actions must be completed, however, before a parallel development work effort can begin:

1. The CRV contains several important building blocks that must be completed before initiating the domain team work.
2. Agreement must be reached on the identification and definition of the infrastructure domains, including which domains will have highest development priority.

Members agreed to provide their recommendations on the infrastructure domains and domain priorities to the workgroup by July 10, 2000. The recommendations will be compiled by Bryan Drake and distributed for review prior to the next workgroup meeting. Final domain selection and prioritization will be an agenda item for the meeting.

A proposed outline for domain architecture documentation was presented to the workgroup. Members agreed that the outline provides a good framework for domain development and reinforces the need to do some preparatory work prior to commencing specific domain development. Members agreed to review the draft COV EA Infrastructure Domain Documentation outline and provide feedback to the workgroup staff prior to the next meeting.

The workgroup then discussed the need to understand or document the current state of the architecture (the "as is") as a prelude to domain development. The amount of "as is" information actually required at this point is unclear. The consensus of the workgroup was that an exhaustive inventory of the current Commonwealth architecture was neither required nor feasible at this juncture. The recommended approach was "just enough (as is) architecture, just in time." In other words, decisions about gathering current architecture information would be made within the context of the specific work that was being undertaken. For example, domain teams would decide what "as is" information they need to complete work on their domain.

The workgroup returned to a discussion of the current CRV (Version 1.0), developed and approved by COTS. Members agreed to adopt the CRV, as written, and to place emphasis on rapid completion of the remaining incomplete sections of the CRV. Dan Ziomek will coordinate an all-day workshop(s) to develop missing components of the CRV and to initiate development of the CA.

The final discussion on the agenda was a review of the draft COV EA Work Plan. Members provided suggestions for revision of the plan to reflect a modified parallel strategy. Dan Ziomek will draft a second revision to the plan and distribute it for review prior to the next meeting.

### **Summary of Workgroup Decisions and Action Items (Action Item assignments are underlined.) :**

1. Action: Members are to review the EA Web site and make recommendations to Dan Ziomek for design improvements.
2. Action: Dave Molchany will present the revised COTS EA Workgroup Statement of Purpose to COTS at their next meeting. (Note: The workgroup report to COTS on July 20, 2000 should include a summary of decisions made and actions taken by the workgroup at both the June 6<sup>th</sup> and June 28<sup>th</sup> workgroup meetings.)
3. Decision: The consensus of the workgroup is that a parallel development strategy, defined as the simultaneous development of the Common Requirements Vision (CRV) and Conceptual Architecture (CA) along with a "drill-down" development of selected, priority domain architectures, will have the greatest probability of long term success and immediate payback.
4. Action: Members agreed to provide their recommendations on the infrastructure domains and domain priorities to the workgroup by July 10, 2000. Final domain selection and prioritization will be an agenda item for the next workgroup meeting.
5. Action: Members agreed to review the draft COV EA Infrastructure Domain Documentation outline and provide recommended changes to Bryan Drake prior to the next meeting.
6. Decision: The consensus of the workgroup was that an exhaustive inventory of the current Commonwealth architecture was neither required nor feasible at this juncture. The general, recommended approach was "just enough (as is) architecture, just in time."
7. Decision & Action: Members agreed to adopt the CRV, as written, and to place emphasis on rapid completion of the remaining incomplete sections of the CRV. Dan Ziomek will coordinate an all-day workshop(s) to develop missing components of the CRV and to initiate development of the CA.
8. Action: Dan Ziomek will draft a second revision to the draft work plan and distribute it for review prior to the next meeting. Final approval of the plan will be an agenda item for the next meeting.
9. Action: Members were asked to come prepared at the next meeting to set a meeting schedule through the end of the year.

### **Meeting Schedule:**

The frequency of future meetings was discussed. Members generally agreed that the workgroup would need to meet at least every 2-3 weeks if meaningful progress was going to be made on development of the COV EA. Members were asked to come prepared at the next meeting to set a meeting schedule through the end of the year. The

next meeting will convene at 1 PM on July 20, 2000 in the Secretary of Education "Smart Conference Room," located on the 18<sup>th</sup> floor of the James Monroe Building.